REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3-13, 15-17, 19-21, and 23-43 are presently active in this case. The present Amendment amends independent Claims 1, 13, 17, and 21 without introducing any new matter.

In the November 16, 2009 Office Action, Claims 1, 3-13, 15-17, 19-21, and 23-43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Logan et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0093790, hereinafter "Logan").

In response, Applicants' independent Claim 1 is amended to recite that the "installation region" indicates a geographic region where the terminal apparatus of the one or more user devices is installed. These features find non-limiting support in Applicants' disclosure as originally filed, for example at page 29, lines 9-11, where it is recited that the reference information encoding unit 103 reads out a region code of a region where a terminal apparatus of the user is installed from the session information. No new matter has been added by these amendment.

In response to the rejection of Claims 1, 3-13, 15-17, 19-21, and 23-43 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), in light of the amendments to the independent claims, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this rejection and traverse the rejection, as discussed next.

Briefly summarizing, independent Claim 21 is directed to a bulletin board system that supports information exchange for contents including reference data arranged in time series. The system includes, *inter alia* a related information receiver configured to receive related information from one or more user devices, the related information including an identification of the contents, user remarks to the contents, and a reference time position of

the user remarks relating to the contents, a reference information receiver configured to receive reference information from the one or more user devices, the reference information including a keyword specifying contents to be referred to by the user remarks to the contents, and specifying a time reference position in the contents. In addition, the system includes a unit for specifying an installation region of a terminal apparatus of the one or more user devices to be a provision destination of information, ***the installation region indicating a geographic region where the terminal apparatus of the one or more user devices is installed***; and a unit that changes contents of reference information according to the specified installation region.

The pending Office Action rejected the term "installation region" of Applicants' independent Claim 1 based on paragraphs [0047], [0130], [0319]-[0320] of Logan. (Office Action, p. 3, ll. 3-6, p. 14, ll. 8-10.) However, Applicants' amended independent Claim 1 now specifically requires that the installation region indicates a geographic region where the terminal apparatus of the one or more user devices is installed. This feature is not taught in the cited passages of Logan, as next discussed.

Logan is directed to a system for utilizing metadata created either at a central location 111 for shared use by connected users, or at each individual user's location 135, to enhance user's enjoyment of available broadcast content. (Logan, Abstract, Fig. 1.) Logan explains that preference data supplied by the user or derived from an analysis of the user's use of the system, or from the viewer's demographic characteristics, may be combined with or used instead of metadata and preference data created at the remote location. (Logan, ¶ [0048]). Based on a selection made by a user, meta data based on the user's preferences can be sent to the user location and played on a screen 190. (Logan, ¶ [0047], Fig. 1)

Moreover, in Logan, metadata can be used to describe segments of content, and can be used to facilitate the task at the user location of generating still further supplemental metadata which describes, rates, annotates or recommends programming content for other users. (Logan, ¶ [0059]). Logan explains that metadata can be developed to characterize individual program segments by processing log file data representing choices made by users in selecting and/or abandoning programs, and from program ratings expressly provided by users, to generate preference data. (Logan, ¶ [0130]). Moreover, Logan explains that by using demographical data on users, rating information for the meta data can be generated, to indicate which viewers have similar backgrounds and similar past preferences. (Id.)

Moreover, Logan details that by using the preference data and the demographical data of the content that is currently played at a user, personalized advertisement on a display information pane 412 can be generated. (Logan, ¶¶ [0319]-[0320], Fig. 4.) In particular, Logan explains the following:

> Advertisements displayed in the information pane 412 may be selected based on the content of the then-selected segment. For instance, an advertisement could be displayed at 412 for a video on demand (VOD) movie related to the topic in the then-playing segment . . . The advertising displayed in the information pane 412 may also be personalized to each household, or to the current viewer, by using stored preference or demographic data to select advertisements which are more likely to be of interest to the particular household or viewer. A combination of content monitoring and viewer/household preference data may be used to select the advertisement displayed.

(Logan, ¶ [0320], portions omitted.) In other words, Logan explains that the displayed advertisement can be selected based on the stored preference or demographic data, to create user or household personalization of the advertisement, based on meta data of the video content. But these passages of Logan fail to teach that his system includes a unit for specifying an installation region of a terminal apparatus of the one or more user devices, where the installation region indicates a geographic region where the terminal apparatus is

installed. As a fact, the cited passages of Logan are silent on such a feature. There is absolutely no knowledge in Logan's system related to a region where an apparatus is installed. In addition, Logan also fails to teach a unit that changes contents of reference information according to the specified installation region. As discussed above, in Logan, the personalization of advertisement results from preference and demographic data associated with the content, but not from any region specific data.

Moreover, the cited passages of Logan at paragraphs [0331]-[0335] fail to teach the above features of Applicants' independent Claim 21. In these passages Logan discusses that metadata associated to a content can include market distribution data, and this data may include ZIP codes to define an area of the market. (Logan, ¶¶ [0331]-[0335]).

> The principal data entity stored describes an instance of a "show;" that is, an entity that defines content that is made available in a specific market, at a specific time, on a specific day. This entity, called a ShowInstance, is a data object from which market data, general show data, and specific segment data can be extracted in order to separate instances for reusability and scaling purposes . . . Each ShowInstance specifies its airdate, what market it is in, what show it is . . . [a] Market will be defined by zip code, MSO, and name, as well as potential scheduling information.

(Logan, ¶¶ [0332]-[0333], portions omitted.) In other words, this passage explains that Logan can distribute data based on ZIP codes to dedicated areas. However, a mere definition of a broadcast market by ZIP codes, to schedule video content, as taught by Logan, is not a unit for specifying an installation region of a terminal apparatus of the one or more user devices, where the installation region indicates a geographic region where the terminal apparatus is installed. Logan's system has no knowledge of where the terminal apparatuses are installed, as required by Applicants' independent Claim 21.

Therefore, the applied reference Logan fails to teach every feature recited in Applicants' Claim 21, so that Claims 21, 23-43 are believed to be patentably distinct over

Logan. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully traverse, and request reconsideration of the rejection based on this reference.

Independent Claims 1, 13, and 17 recite features that are analogous to the features argued above with respect to independent Claim 21, albeit directed to different statutory classes. Accordingly, for the reasons stated above for the patentability of Claim 21, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections of Claims 1, 13, and 17 and the rejections of all associated dependent claims, are also believed to be overcome in view of the arguments regarding independent Claim 21.

Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited passages of Logan fail to teach every feature recited in Applicants' dependent claims. For example, dependent Claim 43 requires that the bulletin board system uses a date and time *when the remark is written* as retrieval conditions. It seems that the passages provided by the pending Office Action does not specifically teach this feature. (See Office Action, p. 6, ll. 14-20, pointing to Logan, ¶ [0282], [0361]-[0366]). In Logan, content data can be arranged with playlist manager that presents a list of program segments that are available in the user's personal library. (Logan, ¶ [0282], ll. 1-8.) Logan further explains that users may sort the program listing by artist, program name, date and time of capture, source (e.g. radio station call letters), recording quality, user rating, and other parameters. (Logan, ¶ [0282], ll. 9-12.) But nowhere in the cited passages of Logan there is a search feature were a date and time when a *remark* is written into a bulleting board can be searched. Logan merely allows to sort a list based on a "date and time of capture," which refers to the time of capture of the content itself, and not the associated metadata. Therefore, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of Applicants' dependent claims.

The present amendment is submitted in accordance with the provisions of 37 C.F.R. § 1.116, which after Final Rejection permits entry of amendments placing the claims in better

form for consideration on appeal. As the present amendment is believed to overcome outstanding rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), the present amendment places the application in better form for consideration on appeal. In addition, the present amendment is not believed to raise new issues because the changes to Claims 1, 13, 17 and 21 are of a minor nature. It is therefore respectfully requested that 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 be liberally construed, and that the present amendment be entered.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment, no further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application, and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal Allowance. A Notice of Allowance for Claims 1, 3-13, 15-17, 19-21, and 23-43 is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner deem that any further action is necessary to place this application in even better form for allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Nikolaus P. Schibli, Ph.D.
Registration No. 56,994

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)